

Wisconsin River Rail Transit Commission

Mazomanie Rail Spur Sub-Committee Meeting

Friday, 3 February 2006 at 10:30 a.m.

Mazomanie Community Building ▪ 9 Brodhead St. ▪ Mazomanie, WI

1. *Call to Order.* **Steve Foye, WRRTC Chair at 10:34**
2. *Roll Call.* **Sub-Committee Members:**
 - Steve Foye
 - Gene Gray
 - Forrest Van Schwartz
3. *Action Item.* **Certification of Public Notice** – *meeting noticed by Graves / gray / van Schwartz / pu*
4. *Action Item.* **Approval of the Agenda** – *prepared by Graves / by consensus.*
5. *Welcome.* **Brief Introductions** – **Steve Foye, WRRTC Chair / welcomed the group / brief introductions of all in attendance / about 18 people.**
6. *Updates.* **Summary Status Reports, which may include –**
 - a) **Village of Mazomanie** - President, Jeff Wirth recapped history / survey / setting up a 501(c)(3) district through their attorney / created TIF district #5 and part of the planned projects are rehab of the rail corridor.
 - b. **WSOR** – Ken Lucht / very much cooperating with this project / great community enhancement / priorities – similar size siding and length and secure and permanent access / feel that their interests are being met.

FVS asked that the record show that everyone involved w the rr has been incredibly cooperative and helpful.

 - c. **WisDOT** – Frank Huntington and Vicki Schaefer

FH said, have not been actively involved to-date, but if the agreement meets the RR needs, WisDOT would be willing to release the easement, if necessary, and believe that the property is the village's under an easement – would release that.

 - d. **County & State / Tryg** – **commend all of the parties and Mazo will benefit.**

Jim Tracy – must meet current standards for rr.

 - e. **WRRTC**

Foye turned to Graves who had no additional info at this point.

7. *Discussion.* **Expectations & Timeline**

SF hands off to FVS / told story of Mr. Westland's to create a park / Viste / Wirth / park / need to remove track / how to remove the track and keep the rr interests whole / may not be used often, but RR does have a need, throughout the year, for a siding and, under the agreement, would have to be made whole / Viste and FVS talked w present Roundy's management and they saw no need for use of the spur under their distribution plan in the foreseeable future / owner of the property indicated that he would deed the track and a portion of the loading dock / village would deed the property to the WRRTC and WisDOT has indicated no interest in being a party to that agreement / not unusual for the Commission to own property independent of WisDOT / ongoing dialogue w WSOR to discuss how the traffic could be rearranged at the Roundy's site to meet WSOR's needs / a plan has been put together w Knapp RR for this / timeline was developed in October, and the project is about a month ahead of the schedule / this arrangement would preserve rail access for Roundy's, or a future user of that site, with addition of a turn-out to serve a rail customer / not aware of any impediments to proceeding / kudos kudos kudos.

Questions – will a fence have to be put up by Roundy's – they are very concerned about security (the person works

there) / FVS explained that there will be complete fencing extended to the east to protect all interested parties, including Roundy's, and it will be secured. The questioner said that they are locked down during certain times. FVS said it will be fenced and part of that is to ensure that no snow is moved to close to the relocated trackage.

Foye said he thought there were people who want to know the timetable for the park and the downtown improvements, and asked Wirth for that. He responded that it would not happen until the other work was completed; FVS outlined the schedule for the work at the Roundy's site – fence installed / track at Roundy's relocated and resurfaced / accepted by RR / w their sign-off and RR taking use of it / work would begin downtown to take out the existing rail and switch / Viste said, in the scheduling, it would be wise to have acceptance of the work at Roundy's be efficient, so the contractor doesn't have to remobilize before starting downtown / FVS they are wonderfully cooperative at Knapp and should be no delays with the RR / Knapp guy clarified that the new gate has to be installed before they can do their work / further clarification...

Foye – I think some people would like to know the timeline for the PARK. Wirth said that Mr Westland is eager to move forward / Viste said that Westland is working with a landscaping company and the detailed plan is near completion and they hope to be able to move ahead as soon as possible – mid-April would be ideal – and they envision 4-6 weeks for the landscaping. / FVS so by labor day and maybe the 4th of July / Wirth village got a BUILD grant and their work and Mr Westland's will be coordinated. / hope to have it done by Sept 1. / Cost for all of the work will be done by others – none will be borne by the Commission, except perhaps for legal review of docs.

Foye – when work is done on the corridor with anything that may swing over track or go on the the ROW (25 feet from the centerline), someone from the RR has to be there – if could have an agreement that that would NOT happen, that would be helpful / KL said, need to have a permit and would need to have a flagman present, so that would need to be coordinated. / FVS re the requirement that the rail corridor be fenced and will use decorative wrought iron fence / Wirth – is the ROW consistent? / Vicky – all of it is 33 feet, except for the depot but that is outside the scope of the project, so it's 33' outside of the centerline. / FVS – the fenceline would be, by agreement, 1' onto the village's property / will be a decorative fence / Wirth – JHG has provided a copy of RWT guide with many ideas and these resources and Trains mag will be accessible to the BUILD committee. question – restriction on the height of the fence / FVS visualized at 43" / EB – does the village have any zoning that should be considered? / Clerk did not think so / EB asked if there may be any restrictions on fence heights / clerk – they would be 5' / EB would like to see the Village's zoning regs / Gray – fencing should complement the beautification / Viste – 33' from the centerline is 66' and that's a pretty big swath of land and a train uses ??? asked, who is going to take care of the land inbetween so it doesn't become an eyesore : suggested this group may want to think about having the fencing closer in and make it easier to maintain as part of the park / FVS referred it to WisDOT / Tracy – RR sprays 16' from the center of the track and by state statute, but maintain to full ROW – Tracy suggested that grass be planted with the fence area to keep other weeds down / who would MOW it? / after more discussion, turned to Vicki and the need to maintain the easement area – if something fell from the train or there was a derailment / Ken speed is ~10mph / Tracy – there is a problem with maintenance / Viste referred to Middleton and the bike path there / FH said, we're talking apples to oranges and this is not akin to the bike trail – we made it clear from the beginning that we have this issue and want to stick to that – could see some arrangement for maintenance, but would not want to let the fencing go onto the ROW / Wirth asked about the fencing at the University? / VS said, that would be the UW's fencing and 1' from the ROW on the U's property / Viste compared to the University and use and... / FVS – a lot of that's historical and was sold off, but those examples would have no bearing / Foye said, for many years we didn't have much to say about Madison to Middleton because didn't have ownership / the only issue that has come before this body was related to a bike trail and the other issues were put in place before this body took over, and they would not have been allowed by this Commission and we're trying to address these issues – in Arena, we mow the whole ROW in Arena up to the ballast and we have a park along there and use yellow tape to separate the public when we have an event and most of the Villages take care of the maintenance to keep things attractive and keep it mowed – kind of an unwritten policy / Wirth – but now, we'd have a BARRIER – a fence – and would like to have some discussion to ensure that everyone's concerns are met as part of preparing the agreement.

8. Discussion. Draft Agreement(s), Eileen Brownlee, WRTC Attorney

a. **Example(s) & Points to Consider** / EB referenced that most of this is related to land transfers – easement releases and deeds are fairly straightforward but if property is going to be moved or installed, all of the parties should be in agreement / the 501c3 which wasn't anticipating may depend upon the determination letter is received and that may take some time, but hope that won't be too much of a delay / the certified survey needs to be done – clerk said would go to plan comm. and

vil board – and issues related to maintenance would have to be agreed upon in advance

Graves asked EB to summarize the draft agreement which had been provided / EB said it was a template...

FVS said that he would come up with the “who does what to whom” list in February since he’s been involved since day one.

Foye asked Wirth if he was in agreement w EB coming up with a draft that incorporates these issues and would go to our Commission and to Village board / time is of the essence and should get going /

b. **Status of Survey?**

c. **Draft Agreement preparation / process / review?**

9. Discussion. Process Steps & To-Do List

Foye – pretty well covered.

10. Action Item. Sub-Committee Recommendation(s) to the WRRTC.

FVS – will make the full commission aware of this meeting and discussion and has been supportive of this project.

Foye – announced the meeting and invited people to come to speak.

Ken – what will be on the agenda – the draft agreement?

EB – no.

Foye said he could call a special meeting.

EB – from a practical standpoint, to get the survey and other pieces – will likely be the March 10th meeting.

FVS – other things need to happen first.

11. Action Item. Set another meeting date?

Not seen as necessary.

Other comments?

None

Foye – thank you and has been a pleasure and thanks to the crowd

12. Action Item. Adjournment. At 11:28 a.m.